



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/498,893	02/07/2000	Steven A. Gronemeyer	ST97001C11(209-US-C11)	9438
34408	7590	07/26/2006	EXAMINER	
THE ECLIPSE GROUP 10605 BALBOA BLVD., SUITE 300 GRANADA HILLS, CA 91344				ODOM, CURTIS B
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2611

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SF

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/498,893	GRONEMEYER, STEVEN A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Curtis B. Odom	2634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-9,11,12,14,15,17-23,26-29,39-42 and 44 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-9,11,12,14,15,17-23,26-29,39-42 and 44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. In claim 1, line 6, the phrase “a complex mixer” is suggested to be changed to “a time domain signal processor comprising a complex mixer”. It is the understanding of the examiner that the mixer, product generation circuit, summing circuit, square root circuit, and output processing circuit are all components of the “time domain signal processor”. See previous set of claims in the amendment dated 10/11/2005.
 - b. In claim 1, line 19, the phrase “a time domain signal processor in signal communication” is suggested to be changed to “wherein the time domain signal processor is in signal communication”.
 - c. In claim 15, page 7, line 16, “couple” is suggested to be changed to “coupled”.
 - d. In claim 15, page 7, line 17, the phrase “to the extract encoded data” is suggested to be changed to “to extract encoded data”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined

Art Unit: 2634

application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,105. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Claim 6 of the patent recites all the limitations of claim 1 of the instant application. Claim 6 of the patent recites a circuit for implementing a matched filter comprising: “a storage circuit”, “a Doppler shift generator”, “a complex mixer”, “complex product generation circuit”, “a summing circuit”, “a square root circuit”, and “an output processing circuit... wherein the code phase and magnitude having of the computed square root value having the largest magnitude indicates a correlation”.

Claim 1 of the instant application recites a system for processing communication data comprising: “a signal sampler”, “Doppler shift system (generator)”, a storage circuit”, “a complex mixer”, “complex product generation circuit”, “a summing circuit”, “a square root circuit”, and “a time domain signal processor...wherein the code phase and magnitude having of the computed square root value having the largest magnitude indicates a correlation”.

Claim 1 of the instant application adds the limitation “a signal sampler”. However, claim 6 of the patent recites “a storage circuit configured to receive and store an input **sample** of a

complex signal". Therefore, although a signal sampler is not directly recited in Claim 6 of the patent, Claim 6 of the patent does recite the signal is sampled, thus making the claims of the patent and instant application not patentably distinct from each other.

4. Claim 9 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6, 044, 105. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Claim 1 of the patent recites all the limitations of claim 9 of the instant application. Claim 1 of the patent recites a method comprising: "receiving an input sample...to be correlated to a code signal", "complex mixing...with a Doppler shift correction value", "computing complex products", "summing the computed complex products", "computing the square root value of the sum of the squares", "shifting the code signal", "repeating the above steps for the current code phase", and "outputting the code phase and magnitude of the computed square root value having the largest magnitude as indication of correlation". Claim 9 of the instant application recites a method comprising: "receiving signal data", "complex mixing...with the Doppler shift correction value", "receiving a code signal", "determining a correlation", "computing complex products", "summing the computed complex products", "computing the square root value of the sum of the squares", "shifting the code signal", "repeating the above steps for the current code phase", and "outputting the code phase and magnitude of the computed square root value having the largest magnitude as indication of correlation". Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other as shown by the recited limitations.

5. Claim 22 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6, 044, 105. Although the conflicting claims

Art Unit: 2634

are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Claim 6 of the patent recites all the limitations of claim 22 of the instant application. Claim 6 of the patent recites a circuit for implementing a matched filter comprising: "a storage circuit to receive a store an input sample...to be correlated to a code signal", "a Doppler shift generator", "a complex mixer", "complex product generation circuit", "a summing circuit", "a square root circuit", and "an output processing circuit... wherein the code phase and magnitude having of the computed square root value having the largest magnitude indicates a correlation". Claim 22 of the instant application recites a system for processing communication data comprising: "means for receiving signal data", "means for providing (generating) a Doppler shift correction value", "a time domain signal processor including a means for storing, means for complex mixing, means for complex product generation, means for summing, means for generating (square root circuit) an envelope, and output processing circuit", "wherein the code phase and magnitude having of the computed square root value having the largest magnitude is an indication of correlation".

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other as shown by the recited limitations.

6. Claim 39 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,105. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Claim 10 of the patent recites all the limitations of claim 39 of the instant application. Claim 10 of the patent recites a computer program, residing on a computer readable medium...the computer program comprising instructions for causing a computer to: "receiving an input sample...to be correlated to a code signal", "complex mix...with a Doppler shift correction value", "compute complex

Art Unit: 2634

products”, “sum the computed complex products”, “compute the square root value of the sum of the squares”, “shift the code signal”, “repeat the instructions for the current code phase”, and “output the code phase and magnitude of the computed square root value having the largest magnitude as indication of correlation”. Claim 39 of the instant application recites a computer readable medium having software...the computer readable medium comprising: means for receiving signal data”, “means for applying a Doppler shift correction value”, means for receiving the code signal”, “means for determining a correlation including means for computing complex products, means for summing, means for computing the square root value of the sum of the squares, means for shifting the code signal, and means for outputting the code phase and magnitude having of the computed square root value having the largest magnitude as an indication of correlation”.

Claim 39 of the instant application does not address (eliminates) the limitation “repeat the instructions (correlation)...for the current code phase” as recited in claim 10 of the patent. It has been held that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. See *In re Karlson*, 136 USPX 184 (CCPA 1963). Also note *Ex parte Rainu*, 168 USPQ 375 (BdPatApp&Int 1970); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one skilled in the art. Therefore, it is the understanding of the examiner that elimination of the repetition of the instructions (correlation) would not prohibit the remaining elements from performing correlation instructions.

7. Claim 15 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6, 004, 105 in view of Krasner (previously cited in Office Action 4/21/2005).

Claim 6 of the patent recites a circuit for implementing a matched filter comprising: “a storage circuit to receive a store an input sample...to be correlated to a code signal”, “a Doppler shift generator”, “a complex mixer”, “complex product generation circuit”, “a summing circuit”, “a square root circuit”, and “an output processing circuit... wherein the code phase and magnitude having of the computed square root value having the largest magnitude indicates a correlation”. Claim 15 of the instant application recites a system for processing communication data comprising: “a signal sample receiver”, “Doppler shift corrector (generator)”, “a code signal receiver”, “a processor including a complex mixer, complex product generation circuit, a summing circuit, a square root circuit, and, a controller (output processing circuit)”, “wherein the code phase and magnitude having of the computed square root value having the largest magnitude is an indication of correlation”.

Claim 15 of the instant application also adds the limitation “a signal processor...operable to process the signal data to extract encoded data.” However, Krasner discloses a demodulator (Fig. 9, block 400b) representing a signal processor coupled to the signal sample receiver (of the acquisition circuit 400a), the signal processor operable to process the signal data to extract encoded (modulated) data (column 13, lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include this feature obtain the received signal by demodulation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 20, 22, 23, 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner (previously cited in Office Action 4/21/2005) and in view of Mendelovicz (U. S. Patent No. 6, 005, 903).

Regarding claim 1, Krasner discloses a system (Fig. 4) for processing communication data from a code signal input (PN signal), the system comprising:

a signal sampler (not shown) operable to receive digital GPS signals to produce original samples at 2 samples per chip as described in column 5, line 66-column 6, lines 16;
a Doppler shift system comprising of a microcontroller (Fig. 4, blocks 428) to provide Doppler sample time and Doppler frequency shift correction values as described in column 5, lines 28-50 and shown in Fig. 4 ;

a register bank (Fig. 4, block 418, column 7, lines 58-61) representing a storage circuit to received and store signal data;

a time domain signal processor (Fig. 4, blocks 404, 408, 410, 416, 420, 426) comprising:
a digital frequency translation circuit (Fig. 4, block 404) representing a complex mixer, coupled to the register band and Doppler shift system, for multiplying (mixing) the input signal

Art Unit: 2634

with the Doppler frequency offset correction value (see column 5, lines 28-50) from the microcontroller;

a PN matched filter (Fig. 4, block 408) representing a complex product generation circuit, coupled to the frequency translation circuit and a PN code signal input from the microcontroller, which computes a complex product by multiplying the mixed portion (frequency translated) portion of the signal data with a current PN code phase of a PN code signal (see column 3, lines 28-40, wherein the input signal are multiplied by the current PN code phase (chip) in a matched filter to generate a spike (complex number) as described in column 3, lines 64-column 4, line 5)

a predetection loop integrator (Fig. 4, block 410, column 6, lines 29-45) which sums the complex numbers (spikes) for 20 PN frames (see also column 4, lines 15-25) to generate a coherent integration value;

a magnitude squaring circuit (Fig. 4, block 416) for performing a magnitude square-law operation (see column 5, lines 6-14) of the coherent integration values to obtain a magnitude value;

a post detection loop integrator (Fig. 4, block 420) for processing the magnitude-squared values output from the magnitude squaring circuit as described in column 6, lines 29-45, and

wherein the time domain signal processor is in signal communication with the signal sampler, the Doppler shift system and the code signal input, the time domain signal processor operable to shift the signal data by a Doppler frequency offset correction value (see column 5, lines 37-50, wherein the multiplication frequency shifts signal data) and to determine a correlation in the matched filter between the shifted signal (output from the frequency translation circuit) and the code signal input (PN signal) as described in column 3, lines 29-39, where the

code phase (chip) and the computed magnitude having the largest magnitude (spike) indicates a match (correlation) between the transmitted (shifted) waveform and the PN code signal (see column 3, lines 64-column 4, line 3) and wherein the time domain signal processor is a matched filter processor in that it contains a matched filter (see Fig. 4, block 404).

Krasner does not disclose the magnitude squaring circuit comprises a square root circuit for computing a square root value of the sum of the sum of the squares of the coherent integration values, each square root having a magnitude and associated phase.

However, Mendelovicz discloses a matched filter correlator (Fig. 4), similar to that of Krasner, which acquires a signal wherein each code (phase) (SSC) modified by Doppler is correlated against each time of arrival (input signal) until a match is found which allows acquisition of the signal (column 6, lines 53-60). The output of the correlator is supplied to a magnitude computation circuit (Fig. 4, block 47) which computes a magnitude and phase of the correlation products (column 11, lines 31-33) by taking a square root value of the sum of the sum of the squares of the correlation values (see column 2, lines 6-9). The largest magnitude values are then used to indicate correlation (acquisition) between the code (SSC) and the data word (input signal), see column 11, lines 33-41. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Krasner to generate a magnitude value using the square root of the sum of the squares as taught by Mendelovicz rather than magnitude-squaring since Krasner states that in order to build up the spikes (magnitudes) used to detect a correlation, a square-law or other detection method (such as the square root of the sum of the squares disclosed by Mendelovicz) can be used to remove varying phase angles (column 4, lines 12-15).

Regarding claim 2, Krasner discloses a GPS signal acquired using a PN code input signal (column 3, lines 26-40) wherein the signals are direct sequence spread spectrum signals (column 1, lines 20-24), wherein acquiring the different GPS signals using the PN code signals (column 1, lines 30-38) is “direct sequence” CDMA processing.

Regarding claim 5, Krasner discloses the Doppler shift system further comprises a microcontroller (Fig. 4, block 428) which generates a Doppler shift represented by a Doppler frequency offset (column 5, lines 28-50), to compensate for Doppler shifts (offsets) in the received signal.

Regarding claim 8, Krasner discloses receiving (column 3, lines 28-30) and sampling (column 5, line 66-column 6, line 8) GPS signals, wherein GPS signals are radio frequency signals.

Regarding claim 9, Krasner discloses a method for processing communication data from comprising:

receiving (column 9, lines 31-35) GPS signal data

applying a Doppler frequency shift correction value using a digital frequency translation circuit (Fig. 4, block 404) which multiplies (mixes) the input signal with the Doppler frequency offset (shift) correction value (column 5, lines 28-50) from the microcontroller as results in a Doppler frequency shifted signal;

receiving a PN code signal at PN matched filter (see Fig. 4, block 408) from microcontroller (Fig. 4, block 428);

determining a correlation (match) between the Doppler shifted signals and the PN code signal in a time domain using a PN matched filter (Fig. 4, block 408) as described in column 3, lines 63-67 that further includes,

computing complex products by multiplying the mixed portion (frequency translated) portion of the signal data with a current PN code phase of a PN code signal (see column 3, lines 28-40, wherein the input signal are multiplied by the current PN code phase (chip) in a matched filter to generate a spike (complex number) as described in column 3, lines 64-column 4, line 5)

summing (Fig. 4, block 410, column 6, lines 29-45) the complex numbers (spikes) for 20 PN frames (see also column 4, lines 15-25) to generate a coherent integration value;

generating a magnitude value (Fig. 4, block 416) by performing a magnitude square-law operation (see column 5, lines 6-14) of the coherent integration values to obtain a magnitude value;

shifting the PN code signal to a next code chip (phase) one time offset at a time (see column 3, lines 33-39)

repeating the above steps for all of the seven code chips (phases) of the frames (see column 3, lines 33-39 and column 4, lines 58-62), where the code phase (chip) and the computed magnitude having the largest magnitude (spike) indicates a match (correlation) between the transmitted (shifted) waveform and the PN code signal (see column 3, lines 64-column 4, line 3)

Krasner does not disclose generating a magnitude comprises computing a square root value of the sum of the sum of the squares of the coherent integration values, each square root having a magnitude and associated phase.

However, Mendelovicz discloses a matched filter correlator (Fig. 4), similar to that of Krasner, which acquires a signal wherein each code (phase) (SSC) modified by Doppler is correlated against each time of arrival (input signal) until a match is found which allows acquisition of the signal (column 6, lines 53-60). The output of the correlator is supplied to a magnitude computation circuit (Fig. 4, block 47) which compute a magnitude and phase of the correlation products (column 11, lines 31-33) by taking a square root value of the sum of the sum of the squares of the correlation values (see column 2, lines 6-9). The largest magnitude values are then used to indicate correlation (acquisition) between the code (SSC) and the data word (input signal), see column 11, lines 33-41. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Krasner to generate a magnitude value using the square root of the sum of the squares as taught by Mendelovicz rather than magnitude-squaring since Krasner states that in order to build up the spikes (magnitudes) used to detect a correlation, a square-law or other detection method (such as the square root of the sum of the squares disclosed by Mendelovicz) can be used to remove varying phase angles (column 4, lines 12-15).

Regarding claim 11, Krasner discloses receiving a Doppler frequency offset (shift) correction value (column 5, lines 28-50) from a microcontroller (Fig. 4, block 428).

Regarding claim 14, Krasner discloses determining the correlation (match) using a matched filter (column 3, lines 55-67).

Regarding claim 15, Krasner discloses a system (Fig. 4) for processing GPS radio frequency data comprising:

a signal sampler (not shown) operable to receive digital GPS signals to produce original samples at 2 samples per chip as described in column 5, line 66-column 6, lines 16;

a Doppler shift corrector comprising of a microcontroller (Fig. 4, block 428) to provide Doppler sample time and Doppler frequency shift correction values as described in column 4, lines 28-50 and shown in Fig. 4 ;

a PN matched filter (Fig. 4, block 408) operable to receive a PN code signal;

a time domain signal processor (Fig. 4, blocks 404, 408, 410, 416, 420, 426) coupled to the signal sampler, the Doppler shift corrector and the code signal receiver, the time domain signal processor operable to shift the signal data by a Doppler frequency offset correction value (see column 5, lines 37-50, wherein the multiplication shifts signal data) and to determine a correlation in the matched filter between the shifted signal (output from the frequency translation circuit) and the code signal input (PN signal) as described in column 3, lines 29-39, and further includes,

a digital frequency translation circuit (Fig. 4, block 404) representing a complex mixer, coupled to the signal sampler, for multiplying (mixing) the input signal with the Doppler frequency offset correction value (column 5, lines 28-50) from the microcontroller;

a PN matched filter (Fig. 4, block 408) representing a complex product processor coupled to the frequency translation circuit and a PN code signal input from the microcontroller, which computes a complex product by multiplying the mixed portion (frequency translated) portion of the signal data with a current PN code phase of a PN code signal (see column 3, lines 28-40, wherein the input signal are multiplied by the current PN code phase (chip) in a matched filter to generate a spike (complex number) as described in column 3, lines 64-column 4, line 5)

a predetection loop integrator (Fig. 4, block 410, column 6, lines 29-45) which sums the complex numbers (spikes) for 20 PN frames (see also column 4, lines 15-25) to generate a coherent integration value;

a magnitude squaring circuit (Fig. 4, block 416) for performing a magnitude square-law operation (see column 5, lines 6-14) of the coherent integration values to obtain a magnitude value;

a controller to determine the code phase (chip) and the computed magnitude having the largest magnitude (spike) as compared to a threshold (see column 5, lines 14-27) indicating a match (correlation) between the transmitted (shifted) waveform and the PN code signal (see column 3, lines 64-column 4, line 3); and

a demodulator (Fig. 9, block 400b) representing a signal processor coupled to the signal sample receiver (of the acquisition circuit 400a), the signal processor operable to process the signal data to extract encoded (modulated) data (column 13, lines 41-43).

Krasner does not disclose the magnitude squaring circuit comprises a square root processor for computing a square root value of the sum of the sum of the squares of the coherent integration values, each square root having a magnitude and associated phase.

However, Mendelovicz discloses a matched filter correlator (Fig. 4), similar to that of Krasner, which acquires a signal wherein each code (phase) (SSC) modified by Doppler is correlated against each time of arrival (input signal) until a match is found which allows acquisition of the signal (column 6, lines 53-60). The output of the correlator is supplied to a magnitude computation circuit (Fig. 4, block 47) which compute a magnitude and phase of the correlation products (column 11, lines 31-33) by taking a square root value of the sum of the sum

Art Unit: 2634

of the squares of the correlation values (see column 2, lines 6-9). The largest magnitude values are then used to indicate correlation (acquisition) between the code (SSC) and the data word (input signal), see column 11, lines 33-41. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Krasner to generate a magnitude value using the square root of the sum of the squares as taught by Mendelovicz rather than magnitude-squaring since Krasner states that in order to build up the spikes (magnitudes) used to detect a correlation, a square-law or other detection method (such as the square root of the sum of the squares disclosed by Mendelovicz) can be used to remove varying phase angles (column 4, lines 12-15).

Regarding claim 20, Krasner discloses the processor is a time domain signal processor (column 3, lines 33-41, wherein comparing the received signal to the PN code signal one **time offset** at a time makes the processor of Krasner a time domain signal processor).

Regarding claim 22, Krasner discloses a system (Fig. 4) for processing communication data from a code signal input (PN signal), the system comprising:

a signal sampler (not shown) operable to receive digital GPS signals to produce original samples at 2 samples per chip as described in column 5, line 66-column 6, lines 16;

a Doppler shift corrector comprising of a microcontroller (Fig. 4, block 428) to provide Doppler sample time and Doppler frequency shift correction values as described in column 5, lines 28-50) and shown in Fig. 4 ;

a time domain signal processor (Fig. 4, blocks 404, 408, 410, 416, 420, 426) coupled to the signal sampler, the Doppler shift corrector and the code signal receiver, the time domain signal processor operable to shift the signal data by a Doppler frequency offset correction value

(see column 5, lines 37-50, wherein the multiplication shifts signal data) and to determine a correlation in the matched filter between the shifted signal (output from the frequency translation circuit) and the code signal input (PN signal) as described in column 3, lines 29-39, wherein the time domain signal processor is a matched filter processor in that it contains a matched filter (see Fig. 4, block 404), and further includes,

a register bank representing a means for storing (Fig. 4, block 418, column 7, lines 58-61) to receive and store signal data;

a digital frequency translation circuit representing a means for complex mixing (Fig. 4, block 404) coupled to the register bank and Doppler shift controller, for multiplying (mixing) the input signal with the Doppler frequency offset correction value (column 5, lines 28-50) from the microcontroller;

a PN matched filter representing a means for complex product generation (Fig. 4, block 408) coupled to the frequency translation circuit and a PN code signal input from the microcontroller, which computes a complex product by multiplying the mixed portion (frequency translated) portion of the signal data with a current PN code phase of a PN code signal (see column 3, lines 28-40, wherein the input signals are multiplied by the current PN code phase (chip) in a matched filter to generate a spike (complex number) as described in column 3, lines 64-column 4, line 5);

a predetection loop integrator representing a means for summing (Fig. 4, block 410, column 6, lines 29-45) which sums the complex numbers (spikes) for 20 PN frames (see also column 4, lines 15-25) to generate a coherent integration value;

a magnitude squaring circuit representing a means for generating a magnitude envelope (Fig. 4, block 416) for performing a magnitude square-law operation (see column 5, lines 6-14) of the coherent integration values to obtain a magnitude envelope value;

a controller representing an output processing circuit to determine the code phase (chip) and the computed magnitude having the largest magnitude (spike) as compared to a threshold (see column 5, lines 14-27) indicating a match (correlation) between the transmitted (shifted) waveform) and the PN code signal (see column 3, lines 64-column 4, line 3);and

Krasner does not disclose the magnitude squaring circuit (means for generating a magnitude envelope) comprises computing a square root value of the sum of the sum of the squares of the coherent integration values, each square root having a magnitude and associated phase.

However, Mendelovicz discloses a matched filter correlator (Fig. 4), similar to that of Krasner, which acquires a signal wherein each code (phase) (SSC) modified by Doppler is correlated against each time of arrival (input signal) until a match is found which allows acquisition of the signal (column 6, lines 53-60). The output of the correlator is supplied to a magnitude computation circuit (Fig. 4, block 47) which compute a magnitude and phase of the correlation products (column 11, lines 31-33) by taking a square root value of the sum of the sum of the squares of the correlation values (see column 2, lines 6-9). The largest magnitude values are then used to indicate correlation (acquisition) between the code (SSC) and the data word (input signal), see column 11, lines 33-41. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Krasner to generate a magnitude value using the square root of the sum of the squares as taught by Mendelovicz rather

than magnitude-squaring since Krasner states that in order to build up the spikes (magnitudes) used to detect a correlation, a square-law or other detection method (such as the square root of the sum of the squares disclosed by Mendelovicz) can be used to remove varying phase angles (column 4, lines 12-15).

Regarding claim 23, Krasner discloses a GPS signal acquired using a PN code input signal (column 3, lines 26-40) wherein the signals are direct sequence spread spectrum signals (column 1, lines 20-24), wherein acquiring the different GPS signals using the PN code signals (column 1, lines 30-38) is “direct sequence” CDMA processing.

Regarding claim 26, Krasner discloses the Doppler shift system further comprises a microcontroller (Fig. 4, block 428) which generates a Doppler shift represented by a Doppler frequency offset (column 5, lines 28-50), to compensate for Doppler shifts (offsets) in the received signal.

Regarding claim 29, Krasner discloses receiving (column 3, lines 28-30) and sampling (column 5, line 66-column 6, line 8) GPS signals, wherein GPS signals are radio frequency signals.

10. Claims 6, 12, and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner (previously cited in Office Action 4/21/2005) and in view of Mendelovicz (U. S. Patent No. 6, 005, 903) as applied to claims 1, 9, and 22, and in further view of Furukawa et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5, 586, 148).

Regarding claim 6, Krasner and Menelovicz do not disclose a lookup table comprising stored precomputed Doppler shift correction values.

Art Unit: 2634

However, Furukawa et al. discloses a coherent detection system which stores precomputed correction values (passbands) which compensate for Doppler shifts related to an input signal (see column 2, lines 50-63). The filter settings (passbands) are selected based on the Doppler shift in the signal. Therefore, it would have been obvious to store precomputed correction values in the system of Krasner and Mendelovicz as taught by Furukawa et al. since Furukawa et al. states implementing these teachings can allow for demodulation of a signal even when a large Doppler shift occurs (column 2, lines 2-4).

Regarding claim 12, Krasner and Menelovicz disclose multiplying (mixing) the input signal with the Doppler frequency offset correction value (see Krasner, column 5, lines 28-50) from the microcontroller. Krasner and Menelovicz do not disclose receiving the Doppler shift correction value from a lookup table.

However, Furukawa et al. discloses a coherent detection system which stores precomputed correction values (passbands) which compensate for Doppler shifts related to an input signal (see column 2, lines 50-63). The filter settings (passbands) are selected based on the Doppler shift in the signal. Therefore, it would have been obvious to store precomputed correction values in a lookup table in the system of Krasner and Mendelovicz as taught by Furukawa et al. since Furukawa et al. states implementing these teachings can allow for demodulation of a signal even when a large Doppler shift occurs (column 2, lines 2-4).

Regarding claim 27, the claimed system includes similar limitations corresponding to the above rejection of claim 6, which is applicable hereto.

11. Claims 7 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner (previously cited in Office Action 4/21/2005) and in view of Mendelovicz (U. S. Patent No. 6,

005, 903) as applied to claims 1, 9, and 22, and in further view of Koenck et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 714, 983).

Regarding claims 7 and 22, Krasner and Mendelovicz do not disclose the Doppler shift system or microcontroller (providing means) is coupled to the time domain signal processor by a data bus.

However, Koenck et al. discloses a high speed communication bus (Fig. 2, element 50) used to communication data between various modules in a data processing terminal (see column 15, lines 28-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to communicate data from the Doppler shift system/microcontroller to the time domain signal processor of Krasner and Mendelovicz using a high-speed bus as disclosed by Koenck since Koenck states the high-speed bus (MBUS) provides reliability advantages (column 15, lines 28-35) and more compact physical routing of the cables between the modules (column 17, lines 42-44).

12. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner (previously cited in Office Action 4/21/2005) and in view of Mendelovicz (U. S. Patent No. 6, 005, 903) as applied to claims 15, and in further view of Nossen (U. S. Patent No. 4,485, 477).

Regarding claim 21, Krasner and Mendelovicz do not disclose the processor used to determined a correlation between the code signal and the Doppler shifted data is a frequency domain processor.

However, Nossen discloses performing matched filter correlation techniques similar to that of Krasner and Mendelovicz in the frequency domain (column 1, lines 55-61), wherein a Doppler shifted signal (column 1, lines 35-43) is compared with a code (PRS) signal to

determine the largest correlation pulse between the signal and the code which represents signal acquisition (see column 1, lines 45-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the processor of Krasner and Mendelovicz as a matched filter frequency domain processor disclosed by Nossen to reduce signal acquisition (searching) time (see Nossen, column 1, lines 52-61).

13. Claims 17-19, 39, 40 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner (previously cited in Office Action 4/21/2005) and in view of Mendelovicz (U. S. Patent No. 6, 005, 903) as applied to claims 9 and 15, and in further view of Warren et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 005, 885).

Regarding claims 17-19, Krasner and Mendelovicz do not disclose the system is implemented in computer code operating on a computer processor of CDMA radio receiver, or the system implemented on in a semiconductor device or application-specific integrated circuit (ASIC).

However, Warren et al. discloses a direct sequence spread spectrum radio receiver (Fig. 3, column 2, lines 38-45, wherein CDMA is a direct sequence spread spectrum signal) comprising a matched filter (Fig. 3, block 26) used to correlate the received signal with a code sequence to acquire the original transmitted signal (column 4, lines 26-39). Warren also discloses the receiver can be implemented as a semiconductor device, ASIC, software (computer code) or firmware (see column 6, lines 20-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Krasner and Mendelovicz to allow the system to be implemented as a semiconductor device, ASIC, or

software to increase the adaptability of the system by allowing various adaptations (see Warren et al., column 6, lines 20-23).

Regarding claim 39 and 40, Krasner and Mendelovicz disclose all the limitations of claims 39 and 40 (see above rejection of claim 9) including complex multiplying (mixing) the input signal with the Doppler frequency offset (shift) correction value (see Krasner, column 5, lines 28-50). Krasner and Mendelovicz do not disclose the method of claim 9 written as software in a computer readable medium.

However, Warren et al. discloses a direct sequence spread spectrum radio receiver/method (Fig. 3, column 2, lines 38-45, wherein CDMA is a direct sequence spread spectrum signal) comprising a matched filter (Fig. 3, block 26) used to correlate the received signal with a code sequence to acquire the original transmitted signal (column 4, lines 26-39). Warren also discloses the receiver/method can be implemented as a semiconductor device, ASIC, software (computer code) or firmware (see column 6, lines 20-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Krasner and Mendelovicz to allow the system to be implemented as a semiconductor device, a computer readable medium such as an ASIC, or software to increase the adaptability of the system by allowing various adaptations (see Warren et al., column 6, lines 20-23).

Regarding claim 44, Krasner et al. further discloses processing the Doppler (frequency translatied) shifted data and PN code signal using a matched filter (Fig. 1, block 408)

14. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner (previously cited in Office Action 4/21/2005) and in view of Mendelovicz (U. S. Patent No. 6,

005, 903) and in further view of Warren et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 005, 885) as applied to claim 39, and in further view of Koenck et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 714, 983).

Regarding claims 7 and 22, Krasner, Mendelovicz, and Warren et al. disclose all the limitations of claim 41 including complex multiplying (mixing) the input signal with the Doppler frequency offset (shift) correction value (see Krasner, column 5, lines 28-50). Krasner, Mendelovicz, and Warren et al. do not disclose receiving Doppler shift correction values from a data bus.

However, Koenck et al. discloses a high speed communication bus (Fig. 2, element 50) used to communication data between various modules in a data processing terminal (see column 15, lines 28-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to communicate data such as the Doppler shift correction value of Krasner Mendelovicz, and Warren et al. using a high-speed bus as disclosed by Koenck since Koenck states the high-speed bus (MBUS) provides reliability advantages (column 15, lines 28-35) and more compact physical routing of the cables between the modules (column 17, lines 42-44).

15. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner (previously cited in Office Action 4/21/2005) and in view of Mendelovicz (U. S. Patent No. 6, 005, 903) and in further view of Warren et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 005, 885) as applied to claim 39, and in further view of Furukawa et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5, 586, 148).

Krasner, Mendelovicz, and Warren et al. disclose all the limitations of claim 41 including complex multiplying (mixing) the input signal with the Doppler frequency offset (shift) correction value (see Krasner, column 5, lines 28-50). Krasner, Mendelovicz, and Warren

Art Unit: 2634

et al. do not disclose do not disclose receiving Doppler shift correction values from a lookup table.

However, Furukawa et al. discloses a coherent detection system which stores precomputed correction values (passbands) which compensate for Doppler shifts related to an input signal (see column 2, lines 50-63). The filter settings (passbands) are selected based on the Doppler shift in the signal. Therefore, it would have been obvious to store and receive precomputed correction values in the system of Krasner, Mendelovicz, and Warren et al. as taught by Furukawa et al. since Furukawa et al. states implementing these teachings can allow for demodulation of a signal even when a large Doppler shift occurs (column 2, lines 2-4).

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

King et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5, 175, 557) discloses GPS signals using PN codes can be categorized as "CDMA" signals.

Rodal et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 356, 602) discloses GPS signals are radio frequency signals.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Curtis B. Odom whose telephone number is 571-272-3046. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8-5.

Art Unit: 2634

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on 571-272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Curtis Odom
July 18, 2006